

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The examiner is in receipt of applicant's amendment received 4/10/2007, which was resultant of an interview to discuss the Board of Appeals decision reversing the examiner, but identifying a USC 112 issue (see **Board of Appeals decision 2007-0389** mailed 3/23/2007. The examiner has carefully considered applicant's amendment and does not find it persuasive; therefore, the amendment filed 4/10/2007 will not be entered. However, after discussions with Mr. Soloway the following examiner's amendment is provided along with the following reasons for allowance:

Examiner's Amendment

An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Mr. Norman Soloway on 4/8/2007.

The following amendment is to the claims provided 12/27/2004:

Claim 14 – line 1, delete the phase "headquarters terminal" and insert--
network commerce system--

¹⁶
Line 15, delete "a"

5/31/07

Claim 15 – line 1, delete the phrase “producing/processing terminal” and insert-- network commerce system--

DD 5/31 Line 7, ⁸ delete the phrase “from an orderer” and insert--from said orderer--
DD 5/31 Line 14, ¹⁵ delete “a”

DD 5/31 Claim 16 – In line 1, delete the phrase “An orderer terminal ~~used-in~~”
Line 8, delete the phrase “from an orderer” and insert--from said orderer--
Line 15, delete “a”

DD 5/31 Claim 17 – In line 1, delete the phrase “A payment terminal ~~used in~~”
Line 18, delete “a”

Reasons for Allowance

Claims 1-18 are allowed.

Independent claims 1, 14-18 contain the following allowable subject matter:

As noted on page 4 of Board of Appeals decision # 2007-0389, Garfinkle does not teach *inter alia*, a “headquarters terminal selectively determines the producing/processing terminal according to the received order”. Each of the independent claims recite a similar feature and the independent claims are allowed for this reason.